IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION
Noichte
G
George Hoey Morris
) CIVIL ACTION: 2:05-CV-1069-T
THOMAS M. GOGGANS
·
Defendant)
OBJECTION TO THE RECCOMMEDATION
OF THE MAGNETIAGE JUDGE
OF THE TYPICASI OF POOGE
Comes NOW THE PLAINTIFF GEORGE HOEY MORRIS CUHO
FILES THIS AMMENDED DISTECTION TO THE RECCOMMENDATION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE CONTAINING ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THIS
HONDRABLE COURT.
PLAINTIFF HAS WITHORAWN HIS REQUEST TO MOVE FOWARD
IN forma Dauresic PLAUNTIFF HAS PAID IN FULL HIS FILLING FEE.
IN forma pauperis. PLAUNTIFF HAS PAID IN FULL HISFLUNG FEE. PLAINTIFF THEREFORE PRAYS THAT THIS COURT RENOUNCE ITS
RIGHTS TO SCREENTHIS COMPLAINT IN ACCORDANCE WITH
THE PROVISIONS OF Z8 U.S.C. \$1915 (e) (2) (B).
PLAINTIFF INFORMS THE COURT THAT THE COMPLAINT 'S
NOT A 42 U.S.C. \$ 1983 ACTION AND THAT HE IS NOT BUGATED
TO PROVE a deprivation of a right secured by the Constitution
and laws of the United States nor a deprivation of a right
secured by the defendant activor unper COLOR OF STATE CAU.

THE MACISTANTE JUDGE HAS ERRONIOUSLY CONCLUDED THAT

PLANNIFF IS ONLY ALLEGING INNEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE

OF CONNOL DURING PRE TRIM PROCEEDINGS ON VARIOUS

CRIMINAL PENDLING CHANGES, IT IS MORE CONNECT

TO SAY THAT MIR GOGGANS WOULD NOT COMMUNICATE

WITH THE PLAINTIFF DURING PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS.

MIR GOGGANS WAS INNEFFECTIVE BECAUSE HE FAILED TO

COMMUNICATE WITH THE PLAINTIFF ABOUT ANYTHING.

HE WOULD NOT COMMUNICATE ABOUT HIS FAILURE TO

COMMUNICATE. HE FAILED TO COMMUNICATE AT ALL.

IN FACT, HIS FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE HAD TO HAVE

PREN PURPOSEFUL.

PLAINTIFF HINED Mn. GOGGANS TO FILE AN APPEM TO MORRES & JACKSON et al., THIS COMPLAINT WAS HEARD IN THIS U.S. COURT AND IT INVOLVED THE SIEZURE OF 1000 BOOKS ENTITLED VINGINDVILL. NET AND 800 COMPACT DISCS "YOUNG MODELS" ON THE PREMISE THAT SAID MEDIA WERE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

THE CASE GENERATED AN ENDRANGE AMOUNT OF

PUBLICITY, MOST OF WHICH SEEMED TO SUPPORT THE

NOTION THAT THE BOOKS WERE ILLEGAL AND THAT

THIS PLAINTIFF WAS A CHILD POUNDERAPHER. SEARCH

WARRANTS SEEKING CHILD POUNDERAPHY WERE LATER

EXECUTED UNSUCCESSFULLY SEEMING ILLEGAL PHOTOGRAPHY.

IN FACT, A NON-STOP VENDEDDA ENSUED THAT EFFECTIVELY

RUINFO THIS PLAINTIFF AND PLACED THIM IN TAIL. THOSE

CRIMINAL CASES FOR WHICH THE PLAINTIFF ITINED

MIR COGLAMS RESULTED FROM THIS VENDETTY.

AFTER THIS COURT RESTECTED THE PLAINTIFFS CLAMPS CONCERNING THE MEDIA SIEZURE ON THE BASIS OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY, THE UNDERSIGNED HINED MA GOGGANS TO FILE AN APPEAR TO THE U.S. ELEVENTH CINCUIT COURT THIS PLAINTIFF HAD ALREADY FICED THE REPUIRED NOTICE OF AMERI. GATHER THAN FICE THE APPEAL, THIS DEFENDANT FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS TWAT CASE, HEDIN IT WITHOUT THIS PLAINTIFFS PERMISSION OR KNOWLEGE- I HE UNDERSIGNED LEARNED ABOUT THAT MOTION AFTER HE RECEIVED A COPY UM US. MAIL. IT IS RATHER EASY TO SPECULATE THAT HE DISMISS ED THAT CASE AT THE REQUESTS OF MORRIS ADVENSANCES WITH WHOM Mr. Goggans MUST WORKON A DAILY BASIS, THE ALABAMA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE IS REPRESENTING COUNTRY WHO SPEZED SAID MEDIA. MATTHEW BEAM IS THIS PLAINTIFFS ADVENSARY IN THAT CASE IN UNITED STATES COURT. THE DEFENDANT THEN EXPRESSED HIS INTEREST IN DISMISSING ANOTHER FOURTH AMENOMENT CASE INVOLVING THE ILLEGAL SEANCH OF PLAINTIFFS VEHICLE WITHOUT A WARRANT, ANOTHER ALABAMA ATTORNEY GENERAL CASE. THE ONLY COMMUNICATION THE DEFENDANT PROVIDED WAS HIS RECCOMMENDATION TO DISMISS THIS CASE. HOMAS GOGGANS ACTIONS NOT ONLY MADE IT DIFFICULT TO PROCEED IN THOSE TWO CIVIL CASES; THEY MADE IT VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO UNDERSTAND, MUCH LESS TO PRUCEED IN THE CRIMINAL CASES THAT WERE GENERATED AS A DINEUT RESULT OF THE CLUIC CASES.

(3)

THIS PLAINTIFF PAID THE DEFENDANT \$5000 TO
REPRESENT HIM IN CHSES THAT HE REFUSED TO DISCUSS.
His LACK OF COMMUNICATION WAS SO COMPLETE THAT THIS
PLAINTIFF HINEO ANOTHER ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT HIM
WITHOUT THE KNOWLESS OF Mr. GOGGONS.
THIS PLANTIFFIS A FEDERAL PRISONER WITH NO ACCESS TO
A LAW LIBRARY OR REFERENCE MATERIALS. THE
MAGISTRATE INFORMS PLAINTIFF THAT FRIVOLOUS, CONCLUSIVE
OR GENERAL OBJECTIONS WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED BY
THE DISTRICT COURT, I HE MAGISTRITTE, HOWEVER, HAS
MADE CRITICAL COMMENTS THAT GENERALIZE ABOUT A
23 PARAGRAPH DOCUMENT THAT CONTAINS SPECIFIC
COMPLAINTS, TO ALLOW THE COMPLAINT TO REMAIN
UNANSWERED WOULD BE THE ULTIMATE LACK OF
COMMUNICATION BY THIS DEFENDANT.
1
<u> </u>
RESPECTFULLY SUMMITTED TO THIS COURT BY
12 NEC 2005 Hall 3
DATE GEORGE HOEY MONRIS
FEDERAL ANNEX
MONTGOMERY CITY JALL
MONTGOMERY CITY JALL MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA 36101
l'

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HENERY CENTIFY THAT I HAVE PROVIDED A

COPY OF THIS OBJECTION TO THE MOTION OF THE

MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO THE DEFENDANT BY PLACING

SAME IN THE U.S. MALL POSTAGE PREPAID AND

PROPERLY ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS.

THOMAS M. GOGGANS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
2030 EAST SECOND STREET
MONTGOMERY, AL. 36106

MAILED ON: 10 DEC 05

GEORGE HOEY MORRIS

FEDERAL ANNEX

MONTROMEMY JAIL

POBOX 159

MONTROMEMY, AL. 36101

Po Box 159
Montgomen Al 36:01

Montgomery City Jell

US DISTRICT COURT
PO BOX 711
Montgomery, Al 36101
Montgomery, Al 36101

